

**Amendments to the Drawings**

**Fig. 1** (first sheet thereof) has been amended to align several variable names with their usage at element 125, thus correcting typographical errors.

No new matter has been introduced with these corrections.

Serial No. 10/675,418

-12-

RSW920030221US1

**REMARKS**

The Specification and Drawings have been amended. Claims 1, 7 - 10, 13 - 15, 18 - 20, and 26 - 27 have been amended. Claims 2 - 6, 11 - 12, 16 - 17, 21 - 25, and 28 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice. Claims 29 - 32 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1, 7 - 10, 13 - 15, 18 - 20, 26 - 27, and 29 - 32 are now in the application.

**I. Proposed Replacement Drawing**

A proposed replacement drawing is provided herewith for Fig. 1 (first sheet thereof), as discussed above in "Amendments to the Drawings". No new matter has been introduced with this proposed replacement drawing.

**II. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §101**

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action dated November 1, 2005 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claims 1 - 26 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Appropriate amendments have been made herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

**III. Double-Patenting Rejections**

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 8 and 26 are provisionally

Serial No. 10/675,418

-13-

RSW920030221US1

rejected under 35 U. S. C. §101 as claiming the same invention as various claims of (co-pending) application serial number 10/674,769. Paragraph 9 of the Office Action states that Claims 22 and 27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 18 of the same co-pending application.

Independent Claim 22 has been cancelled from the application without prejudice, rendering the double-patenting rejection moot as to that claim. Independent Claims 1, 26, and 27 have been amended herein to clarify that the limitations are performed "at a client device". This is in contrast to the server-side limitations of co-pending related application serial number 10/674,769. Applicants believe this sufficiently distinguishes the subject matter of the two applications. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw these double-patenting rejections.

IV. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §102(b)

Page 11 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,300,947 to Kanevsky. Claims 2 - 6, 11 - 12, 16 - 17, 21 - 25, and 28 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice, rendering the rejection moot as to those claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to remaining Claims 1, 7 - 10, 13 - 15, 18 - 20, and 26 - 27.

Serial No. 10/675,418

-14-

RSW920030221US1

Applicants respectfully submit that their independent Claims 1, 26, and 27 specify limitations not taught by the cited reference. Applicants find no teaching in Kanevsky, for example, of “a markup language document that specifies a Web page for rendering on a display of the client device, wherein the specification of the Web page further comprises, for at least one component of the Web page, syntax defining a plurality of alternative selectable views of the component and conditions under which each of the views should be selected for rendering” (Claim 1, lines 3 - 7, emphasis added; see also Claim 26, lines 3 - 7). Claim 27 is similar, but specifies “... for each of at least two components ...” (Claim 27, lines 4 - 8, emphasis added).

See, for example, reference numbers 135 - 170 of Fig. 1, which correspond generally to “syntax defining a plurality of alternative selectable views of the component ...”. As illustrated therein, each of the selectable views for the sample component is specified using a “<div>” element (having 3 alternative views 140, 150, and 160, in this example).

Furthermore, Applicants find no teaching in Kanevsky of (*inter alia*) the following limitations:

- “wherein the syntax defining the plurality of alternative selectable views comprises a markup language element in the markup language document, and wherein each of the alternative selectable views is specified as a child element of the markup language element” (Claim 8, lines 1 - 5, emphasis added);

- “wherein the syntax defining the conditions is specified as executable logic within the markup language document” (Claim 9, lines 1 - 2, emphasis added);
- “wherein the syntax defining the conditions is specified in the markup language document as a reference to externally-stored logic that performs the evaluating step” (Claim 20, lines 1 - 3, emphasis added);
- “wherein one of the one or more evaluated factors comprises a current processing load on the client device” (Claim 30, lines 1 - 2, emphasis added);
- “wherein one of the one or more evaluated factors comprises applications currently executing at the client device” (Claim 31, lines 1 - 2, emphasis added); or
- “wherein one of the one or more evaluated factors comprises network connections currently open at the client device” (Claim 32, lines 1 - 2, emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that their independent Claims 1, 26, and 27 are patentable over Kanevsky. Dependent Claims 1, 7 - 10, 13 - 15, 18 - 20, 26 - 27, and 29 - 32 are therefore deemed patentable by virtue of (*inter alia*) the allowability of the independent claims from which they depend.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection.

Serial No. 10/675,418


-16-

RSW920030221US1

**V. Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168  
Phone: 407-343-7586  
Fax: 407-343-7587

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (1)